

## DR MOWLAM'S MEETING WITH THE UUP, 16 SEPTEMBER: KEY UUP POINTS

*(Comments were based on the revised draft procedural motion of 1745 on 16 September)*

### **Paras (i) and (ii): delete.**

Mr Trimble and especially Mr Maginnis were irritated by this language (from the Downing Street Declaration and Ground Rules): their objection was more to the terminology – the 'people of Ireland' and the like, 'Humespeak' that would go down badly with their supporters – than substance.

[Perhaps feasible to meet them: these paragraphs add nothing to the substance of the motion (though the same goes for (iii), which is unionist-friendly)].

### **Paragraph (iii)**

Mr Trimble doubted the new wording – 'subject to public approval in each jurisdiction by referendums' – would go far enough to satisfy the UDP, who had sought something along the lines of 'upon an agreed outcome referendums shall be held in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland to submit to public approval the elements relevant to each jurisdiction', and expressly requiring a positive outcome in Northern Ireland.

[Not clear the UUP are giving this more than a token push].

### **Paragraph (iv) 2(a), first tiret**

The UUP want to delete all after the end of the first line: although inserted in deference to their views, they fear the DUP would exploit it against them.

[There seems little difficulty with this]

### **Paragraph (iv) 2(a), second tiret**

The UUP professed grave difficulties about the Chairmanships question, which seemed to develop as the discussion went on. They were not impressed by the troika idea in the latest draft. They started by noting that what Senator Mitchell told them yesterday – that the Governments wanted him to do all the work of chairing Strand Two, even though General de Chastelain was joint Chairman – had been different from what they had heard before. They had no difficulties with the Senator personally, and had proposed a (genuine) role as stand-in in Strand Two. But some of their supporters found it difficult having an American in place: Mr Empey recalled the abuse they had had from the DUP etc when they had accepted Senator Mitchell's appointment. Mr Trimble said that they had done that on the basis that he would not be in Strand Two. He added another ground of opposition: Strand Two would consider very sensitive issues relating to the British Constitution: and the previous Government had taken the view that only a British subject – like General de Chastelain, or Sir Ninian Stephen in the last talks – could appropriately chair the Strand. There was some further discussion of Senator Mitchell taking the Business Committee, which we reported he was not anxious to do. The UUP affected to see in this and other aspects of the misunderstandings over this signs of lack of impartiality on his part, suggestions which the Secretary of State firmly rebutted. The UUP did not want, when challenged, to see General de Chastelain remain in Strand Two with the Finn at the Independent Commission.

[This might be a very serious issue: it is not clear how strongly the Unionists will press it. Maginnis made much of it, asserting that what he had heard had changed his whole outlook on coming into the talks. Mr Trimble joined in to some extent. There are arguments here



unionists have not offered before in this dispute about the need for the Chairman of Strand Two to be British (why then did they suggest Senator Mitchell might help out?).]

**Paragraph (iv) 2(b), second tiret**

The UUP want to replace 'negotiate' with 'work constructively and'. This is in line with earlier Government language.  
[Ought not to be a problem]

**Paragraph (iv) 2(b), third tiret**

Mr Trimble argued with increasing vehemence for 'note with interest' to be replaced by 'support'. HMG should be prepared to stand over its statement; so should the Irish. We pointed out there was no prospect of such a text gaining sufficient consensus: Mr Trimble demanded to know who was standing out. He suggested this was his chief difficulty.  
[This is reopening a central element of the old decommissioning dispute. We clearly cannot meet Mr Trimble directly, though some presentational change may be possible (eg omit 'with interest')].

**Paragraph (iv) 2(c)(2), second tiret**

Mr Trimble did not like the reference to the Committee 'assisting the implementation' of the Mitchell Report.  
[We may be able to find other language].

**Paragraph (ix) (mislabelled '(iv)')**

Mr Trimble objected to the omission of the wording relating to review plenaries that had been in the Governments' paper (paragraph 6), by which they would offer participants the opportunity to 'consider whether the necessary confidence and momentum towards agreement is being sustained'.  
[It should be possible to reintroduce such wording in the motion].